

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 13, 2009, has been carefully considered together with each of the references cited therein. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. The amendments made herein are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically in claim 1, the Office states and "or" should be inserted before "bromine" in the definition of R_2 . Such amendment has been made.

The Office states that in the definition of R_2 the phrase "(* attached to the nucleus)" is not clear. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended such language to state, "attached to K_1 ."

The Office finds in claim 2, part (a), an "or" should be inserted before the last substituent listed. Such amendment has been made.

The Office states in claim 3, line 6, an "or" should be inserted before "2, 6-dicyano-4-nitrophenyl." Such amendment has been made.

In claim 3, last line, the Office states the variables R'_1 , R'_2 and R'_4 are not defined above. By this Amendment, the definition of such variables are now in claim 3.

In claim 9, the Office states that an "or" should be inserted before "triacetate." Such amendment has been made.

The Office states that claim 11 is indefinite because it refers to "a process according to claim 1", however, claim 1 is not drawn to a process." By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 9 to depend from claim 4.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully contended that the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph rejections, have been overcome.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1 to 11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as the Office states that the specification is enabled for only a certain process. The Office was courteous enough to describe the process it believes is enabled. By this Amendment, claim 4, the main process claim, has been amended as suggested by the Office. In view thereof, it is respectfully contended that the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph rejection has been overcome.

In view of the forgoing remarks, the present Application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of it is requested. If the Office disagrees, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney for Applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony A. Bisulca
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,913

(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)

Clariant Corporation
Industrial Property Department
4000 Monroe Road
Charlotte, North Carolina 28205
Phone: (704) 331-7151
Fax: (704) 331-7707